Smith's Report

No. 184 *Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990* August 2011
Online at www.codoh.com

What to Do about Campus Bogeyman Bradley Smith: A Manual for Action

By Jett Rucker

At age 56 (younger by far than our Bradley Smith), I returned to a college campus as a hyperannuated student, far more eager to learn than I was in those days when enrollment in college was one means to defer the draft for us males. I noticed many changes on campus after some forty years, but one thing, particularly noticeable at night, had nothing to do with advances in learning. That was "panic stations," those pole-mounted telephones or buttons surmounted by a blue light by means of which anyone in fear for their physical safety could signal the campus police to the rescue. A small step forward for technology, I thought, at the same time a great leap backwards for society, or the standards by which its members deport themselves.

Today there lurks on campuses in America a bogeyman thought by many parents, administrators, and appropriations-voting politicians to have been banished long ago: the specter of Open Debate. Free Thinking—call it what you will—it is today but the faintest vestige of what it

might once have been back in the times when only 1 percent or so of the populace went on to college, and very few women among these, to say nothing of … other groups. This bogeyman has been banished, the parties listed above may be thankful, from the lecture hall, and even from syllabi, not that undergraduates are much troubled with syllabi these days. It has been relegated, one can now almost say, to the occasional (paid) advertisement sequestered in a corner of the page (or screen) of a college newspaper reading something like:

"The Holocaust Question:
THE POWER OF TABOO:
www.codoh.com."

Yes, the Bearded Menace of Bradley Smith may lurk behind any clump of bushes, any corner or shadowed spot on your daughter's campus, and all the blue-lighted panic stations in the world won't protect her from him. The insidious fruit of his temptation might hang invitingly

from the very pages of the campus newspaper. Unless, of course, the campus chapter of Hillel is standing guard to spare your child the atrocity of an open debate.

That's right—between your impressionable son or daughter wandering haplessly through the minefield of free thought still to be found in obscure corners of today's college campuses, there persists nothing more than the thin, blue line interposed by the campus chapter of Hillel. Hillel, you say? The religious organization for Jewish students, you say, if you're particularly cosmopolitan about such things (or Jewish yourself, of course)?

Yes, Hillel. The only campus "religious" organization to officially pronounce the welfare of a foreign state (Israel) to be among its goals, to the detriment, one might suppose, of those states, or even those state-less groups, whose interests are harmed by the advancement of its "welfare," however conceived by whatever group.

Well, does the Roman Catholic student's group advocate the welfare of … the Vatican? My review of the Web site of my university's Catholic organization doesn't mention it, nor the welfare of any other country, not even the one the campus is located in. But my university's Hillel site features this:

"Israel advocacy is a central force in promoting a positive Israel agenda on campus and for developing a cadre of articulate Israel activists. This is an outstanding opportunity for student leaders to affect the culture of Israel on our campus. Through their knowledge of and passion for Israel, we have the ability to have a profound impact on our campus community."

OK. *They* want to make a "profound impact" on the campus community, and they make no bones about it. But none of this figures into Bradley Smith's nefarious agenda. His agenda is that of Open Debate on the Holocaust—mere freedom of speech, and perhaps thought, viewed on its basic plane. But Hillel will not view Smith's agenda on that plane, perhaps because it threatens their own multi-planar agenda, and/or because it's just easier to oppose by smearing it than by engaging it on any of its actual terms.

Bradley Smith would encourage history- (or religion-) minded students to engage a subject studiously avoided on American college campuses: the "Holocaust," as it came to be named sometime in the Mid-Sixties. And Hillel would oppose this effort—with a vengeance. Their own manual for Opposing Bradley Smith's Holocaust Inquiry, on Page 17, warns of a "firestorm" of reaction to the publication of such advertisements, the while counseling in considerable detail just how to ensure that such a "firestorm" (the word "holocaust" once served for this meaning, but it has since been appropriated for another use) ensues, on campus and even beyond, if possible.

The plot to transfer blame for the "disturbance" of campuses populated entirely by young men and women at the heights of their interactive propensities from the parties causing it (Hillel) to the parties offending them (Smith) is transparent to anyone who will examine the Manual for Action. Such a propagandistic inversion is paradigmatic to techniques for the incitement and manipulation of public sentiment, as is studied in departments of political science (not to mention public relations) in campuses everywhere. Its application is stark and revealing to anyone who troubles himself to read the impeccably edited and logically organized 36-page Manual.

The Manual is replete with instructions about Mobilizing Authority, and even using the campus "religious" organization as a trip-wire whose breakage brings down on the hitherto-peaceful campus the brunt of outside forces, starting with the redoubtable Anti-Defamation League. Back in the Dark Ages when I was a college kid, students, faculty, and administration preferred to settle matters on campus internally. But increasingly today, outside police and SWAT teams are called onto the campus even to deal with matters not involving Holocaust denial. This is part of that unsavory trend, but, perhaps uniquely, triggered entirely without even the faintest threat of violence.

The vise-like action of The Campus (Hillel) and The Outside Agitators (ADL) should (Page 18) suffice to assure the opponents of Bradley Smith's nefarious initiative not only access, but positive dominance over the powers that rule camp-

Continued on page 13

What Does Holocaust Denial Really Mean?

By Daniel McGowan

Daniel McGowan, Ph.D., is Professor Emeritus of Economics at Hobart and William Smith Colleges (HWS) in Geneva, New York. Below you will find a story that began almost two years ago with an opinion piece by Professor McGowan that appeared in The Finger Lakes Times *on 27 September 2009.*

Chapter two of the story consists of a Statement signed by six Hobart and William Smith faculty urging the president of the college to deny Professor McGowan the right to call himself "Professor Emeritus."

Chapter three took place on 22 May 2011 when Professor McGowan, having gained access to the Statement by the Contemptible Six, replied to it directly and publicly.

What Does Holocaust Denial Really Mean?
By Daniel McGowan

The Finger Lakes Times,
September 27, 2009

In April 2007 the European Union agreed to set jail sentences up to three years for those who deny or trivialize the Holocaust. More recently, in response to the remarks of Bishop Richard Williamson, the Pope has proclaimed that Holocaust denial is "intolerable and altogether unacceptable."

But what does Holocaust denial really mean? Begin with the word Holocaust. The Holocaust (spelled with a capital H) refers to the killing of six million Jews by the Nazis during World War II. It is supposed to be the Germans' "Final Solution" to the Jewish problem. Much of the systematic extermination was to have taken place in concentration camps by shooting, gassing, and burning alive innocent Jewish victims of the Third Reich.

People like Germar Rudolf, Ernst Zundel, and Bishop Williamson who do not believe this account and who dare to say so in public are reviled as bigots, anti-Semites, racists, and worse. Their alternate historical scenarios are not termed simply revisionist, but are demeaned as Holocaust denial. Rudolf and Zundel were shipped to Germany

Daniel McGowan

where they were tried, convicted, and sentenced to three and five years, respectively.

Politicians deride Holocaust revisionist papers and conferences as "beyond the pale of international discourse and acceptable behavior." Non-Zionist Jews who participate in such revisionism, like Rabbi David Weiss of the Neturei Karta, are denounced as "self-haters" and are shunned and spat upon. Even Professor Norman Finkelstein, whose parents were both Holocaust survivors and who wrote the book, *The Holocaust Industry*, has been branded a Holocaust denier.

But putting aside the virile hate directed against those who question the veracity of the typical Holocaust narrative, what is it that these people believe and say at the risk of imprisonment and bodily harm? For most Holocaust revisionists or deniers if you prefer, their arguments boil down to three simple contentions:

1. Hitler's "Final Solution" was intended to be ethnic cleansing, not extermination.

2. There were no homicidal gas chambers used by the Third Reich.

3. There were fewer than 6 million Jews killed of the 55 million who died in WWII.

Are these revisionist contentions so odious as to cause those who believe them to be reviled, beaten, and imprisoned? More importantly, is it possible that revisionist contentions are true, or even partially true, and that they are despised because they contradict the story of the Holocaust, a story which has been elevated to the level of a religion in hundreds of films, memorials, museums, and docu-dramas?

Is it sacrilegious to ask, "If Hitler was intent on extermination, how did Elie Wiesel, his father, and two of his sisters survive the worst period of incarceration at Auschwitz?" Wiesel claims that people were thrown alive into burning pits, yet even the Israeli-trained guides at Auschwitz refute this claim.

Is it really "beyond international discourse" to question the efficacy and the forensic evidence of homicidal gas chambers? If other myths, like making soap from human fat, have been dismissed as Allied war propaganda, why is it "unacceptable behavior" to ask if the gas chamber at Dachau was not reconstructed by the Americans because no other homicidal gas chamber could be found and used as evidence at the Nuremburg trials?

For more than fifty years Jewish scholars have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to document each Jewish victim of the Nazi Holocaust. The Nazis were German, obsessed with paperwork and recordkeeping. Yet only 3 million names have been collected and many of them died of natural causes. So why is it heresy to doubt that fewer than 6 million Jews were murdered in the Second World War?

"Holocaust Denial" might be no more eccentric or no more criminal than claiming the earth is flat, except that the Holocaust itself has been used as the sword and shield in the quest to build a Jewish state between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River, where even today over half the population is not Jewish.

The Holocaust narrative allows Yad Vashem, the finest Holocaust museum in the world, to repeat the mantra of "Never Forget" while it sits on Arab lands stolen from Ein Karem and overlooking the unmarked graves of Palestinians massacred by Jewish terrorists at Deir Yassin. It allows Elie Wiesel to boast of having worked for these same terrorists (as a journalist, not a fighter) while refusing to acknowledge, let alone apologize for, the war crimes his employer committed. It makes Jews the ultimate victim no matter how they dispossess or dehumanize or ethnically cleanse indigenous Palestinian people.

The Holocaust story eliminates any comparison of Ketziot or Gaza to the concentration camps they indeed are. It memorializes the resistance of Jews in the ghettos of Europe while steadfastly denying any comparison with the resistance of Palestinians in Hebron and throughout the West Bank. It allows claims that this year's Hanukah Massacre in Gaza, with a kill ratio of 100 to one, was a "proportionate response" to Palestinian resistance to unending occupation.

The Holocaust is used to silence critics of Israel in what the Jewish scholar, Marc Ellis, has called the ecumenical deal: you Christians look the other way while we bludgeon the Palestinians and build our Jewish state and we won't remind you that Hitler was a good Catholic, a confirmed "soldier of Christ," long before he was a bad Nazi.

The Holocaust narrative of systematic, industrialized extermination was an important neoconservative tool to drive the United States into Iraq. The same neo-con ideologues, like Norman Podhoretz, routinely compare Ahmadinejad to Hitler and Nazism with Islamofascism with the intent of driving us into Iran. The title of the Israeli conference at Yad Vashem made this crystal clear: "Holocaust Denial: Paving the Way to Genocide."

"Remember the Holocaust" will be the battle cry of the next great clash of good (Judeo/Christian values) and evil (radical Islamic aggression) and those who question it must be demonized if not burned at the stake.

Daniel McGowan
Professor Emeritus
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Geneva, NY 14456

Because of admonishment by the administration, it is hereby stated that the above remarks

are solely those of the author. Hobart and William Smith Colleges neither condone nor condemn these opinions. Furthermore, the author has been instructed to use his personal email address of mcgowandaniel@yahoo.com and not his college email at mcgowan@hws.edu for those wishing to contact him with comments or criticisms.

Letter by Six Hobart and William Smith Colleges Professors to Their President

October 3, 2009

President Gearan,

This letter is a response to Daniel McGowan's defense of Holocaust deniers published in the *Finger Lakes Times* on September 27. The content of the essay and its publication on the eve of Yom Kippur was appalling. We are writing to you because of the disgrace to Hobart and William Smith caused by McGowan's continued use of the institutional imprimatur and his honorary title of "Emeritus Professor" to lend credence in disseminating his personal beliefs. He has every right as a private citizen to hold and spew forth whatever beliefs he may happen to have, but we ask you to prevent the use of his title and the name of Hobart and William Smith from contributing to its effects in the future.

It should be clear that while McGowan is claiming to raise legitimate historical and free speech issues, Holocaust denial has a history of being no more than thinly veiled anti-Semitism. When historians talk about the Holocaust what they mean is that approximately six million Jews and several millions of others were killed in an intentional and systematic fashion by the Nazis using a number of different means, including death by shooting and in gas chambers. This is the position held universally by scholars. The Holocaust deniers reject the historicity of the Holocaust based on three types of assertions. They reject the number of 6 million, the existence of killing camps, and the element of intentionality.

Professor McGowan's article is an example of denying the reality of the most studied and documented event in history. Holocaust denial carries absolutely no weight among academic scholars in any field whatsoever. Additionally, denying the undisputed facts of the holocaust is not a way to show support for the Palestinians. For example, his argument denying the intentionality of the Nazis' execution of Jews is that there is not sufficient proof that it was designed to exterminate the Jewish population. Rather, he asserts, it may have been merely a program of "ethnic cleansing." The suggestion that this somehow makes it less morally reprehensible speaks for itself, as we all know that the term "ethnic cleansing" was introduced to make genocide sound more palatable.

Professor McGowan's position is a classic case of blaming the victims for their own victimization. Promo Levi wrote in *The Drowned and the Saved* that what he most feared was echoed in a remark by one of his SS guards: That if he somehow managed to live through this hell no one would believe his descriptions of Auschwitz. Sadly, for some, that day has arrived.

Freedom of speech is a right for citizens in a democracy that should be vigorously protected, especially when we find the content of that speech to be abhorrent. Colleges and universities have an educational obligation to encourage scholarship that reflects perspectives outside the mainstream of public political discourse, and we encourage that.

Hate speech, on the other hand, is a trickier issue for campuses to wrestle with because while free speech has a special value, we have a duty to protect members of our diverse community from unsupported vitriol being espoused under the name of our colleges and its professors. We faculty of all persuasions, Buddhists, Christians, Muslims, Hindus, Jews, and atheists, are deeply offended and also share a special concern about the impact of such hateful messages (and its association with us) upon our Jewish students, staff, and faculty.

Professor McGowan's actions do not meet our expectation of minimally rational and minimally humane discourse. As human beings who see the transparent motivation and effects of such writing, we are deeply disturbed and saddened to see a Hobart and William Smith title attached to it. We therefore request the removal of Professor McGowan's honorary title of "Emeritus Professor."

Sincerely,

Scott Brophy, Professor of Philosophy

Michael Dobkowski, Professor of Religious Studies

Khuram Hussain, Assistant Professor of Education

Steven Lee, Professor of Philosophy

James McKinster, Associate Professor of Education

Lilian Sherman, Assistant Professor of Education

Professor McGowan Exposes Contemptible Six at Hobart and William Smith Colleges

May 22, 2011

From: Daniel McGowan, mcgowan@hws.edu

To: Faculty at Hobart and William Smith Colleges

Subject: McKinster smear letter sent to you on October 3, 2009

This is an attempt, admittedly futile, to remove some of the slime thrown at me in a letter addressed to President Gearan and circulated to over 250 people on October 3, 2009. It was written by Jim McKinster and five other faculty members and allegedly signed by 32 people in all. I heard about it by happenstance soon after it was circulated, but neither the President nor any of the six who circulated it was willing to provide me with a copy. That is a typical cowardly response employed by those who use this smear method to accuse, try, and censure someone who dares to speak truth to power. (I finally got a copy last week, hence the 20-month delay in my response.)

Their letter and a copy of the op-ed I wrote in the *Finger Lakes Times* are attached.

Allow me to refute the lies and innuendos that these "colleagues" have levied against me, behind my back. Since each of you received the detractors' letter, I am sending you this rebuttal.

1. The purpose of my op-ed was to define Holocaust denial. That should be clear from the byline "What do deniers really mean?" It was submitted in response to the media frenzy and demonization of President Ahmadinejad who addressed the UN General Assembly and whose picture was shown above my guest appearance piece. Instead of acknowledging this, my faculty detractors feigned outrage that it appeared on the eve of Yom Kippur. I had nothing to do with the timing of the article and make no apology for when it appeared vis-à-vis a Jewish holiday.

2. More egregiously these faculty detractors claimed to know my "personal beliefs" and claimed that I misused my title of professor emeritus at Hobart and William Smith Colleges to lend them credence. That is simply a lie. Nowhere are my personal beliefs stated. Moreover my op-ed included an exceptionally long disclaimer showing The Colleges neither condone nor condemn what I had written.

3. The faculty detractors claim that "Holocaust denial carries absolutely no weight among academic scholars in any field whatsoever." That is simply not true. There are a number of scholars who write about the typical Holocaust narrative and are willing to fight the slime hurled at them by ardent Zionists and by others who feel it their duty to protect the narrative which serves as the sword and shield of apartheid Israel. (BTW, our former provost and former William Smith Dean both demanded that I not use the word "apartheid" in connection with Israel; granted the term was used in the Israeli press and later by President Carter, but it was not "suitable discourse" on our campus where we routinely claim to support free speech and diversity of opinion.

4. The faculty detractors write that "denying undisputed facts of the holocaust (sic) is not a way to show support for the Palestinians." First, the three tenets of Holocaust revisionism are clearly not "undisputed." To the contrary, they are hotly and passionately disputed; people's lives are ruined when they even question these "facts." In fourteen countries you can get jail time for disputing "facts" surrounding the Holocaust.

From left to right

Henry Herskovits, Arthur Butz, Daniel McGowan

Second, disputing "facts" is what science and historical analysis is all about. We academics have no problem discussing and disputing whether or not Jesus Christ is truly the son of God, or if President Obama's birth certificate is real, or if President Roosevelt knew a Japanese attack on Hawaii was imminent, but we are not allowed to discuss or dispute the six-million figure.

Third, what gives these detractors the credentials to pontificate on what supports or hurts Palestinians? Some of them have been responsible for feting at Hobart and William Smith Colleges anti-Palestinian demagogues including Wiesel and even Netanyahu. They helped give Madeleine Albright our highest humanitarian award, which is a disgrace in light of her statement that the death of over 500,000 Iraqi children was "worth it." Was I the only one to protest that award?

I have team-taught a senior course on the Palestinians. I have published books and articles on the Palestinian Naqba and the massacre of Arab civilians by Jewish terrorists at Deir Yassin. I have built the only United States memorial to thier dispossession and ethnic cleansing. I don't need, nor accept, biased comments on how to support Palestinians.

5. Calling Holocaust historical revisionism "Holocaust denial" is unnecessarily pejorative. It might be fine for Fox News, but it is not conducive to academic discourse. To call Holocaust revisionism "thinly veiled anti-Semitism" is simply untrue and it demeans scholars and others, including Jews, who question the Holocaust doctrine as we are fed it in hundreds of films, books, articles, and commentaries. Terms like Holocaust Industry, Holocaust Fatigue, Holocaust professional, Holocaust wannabes, and Holocaust High Priest were not coined by "deniers" or anti-Semites; they were coined by Jews. (The High Priest quip is an obvious reference to Wiesel; it was made by Tova Reich in her book *My Holocaust*. Tova's husband, Walter Reich, was the former director of the US Holocaust Museum in Washington.)

In 1946 the US government told us that over 20 million people were murdered by Hitler. Now that figure is said to be 11 million; it is literally carved in stone at the US Holocaust Memorial. For years we were told that over 4 million were killed at Auschwitz, but by the early 1990s that figure was reduced to 1.5 million. Wiesel tells us that people were thrown alive onto pyres; he claims to have seen it with his own eyes; today Yad Vashem trained guides at Auschwitz say that is not true. These are examples of historical revisionism and they are not inherently anti-Semitic.

6. It is most interesting to see academic colleagues say, "(a)s we all know ... the term 'ethnic cleansing' was introduced to make genocide sound more palatable." That means they either deny that Palestinians have been (and continue to be) ethnically

cleansed or they agree that Israel is performing genocide of the Palestinian people.

7. While the faculty detractors found my speech to be "abhorrent," they seemed unable to find fault with a single fact I presented. So they resorted to name-calling and labeled the piece "hate speech" and "unsupported vitriol" and smeared my name to hundreds of people. I am surprised that Abe Foxman or the Mossad did not come calling.

8. The detractors genuinely were concerned about the op-ed's impact on our Jewish students, staff, and faculty. But maybe it is time for all members of the community to see the Holocaust for what it really was and not the unquestionable, unimpeachable, doctrine that makes Jewish suffering superior to that of other people. Maybe it is time to recognize that Zionism as a political movement to create a Jewish state in Palestine began long before the Holocaust and that Zionist discrimination, dehumanization, and dispossession of the Palestinian people should not be excused by it. Maybe it is time to see that since over half the population (within the borders controlled by Israel) is not Jewish, the dream of creating a Jewish state has failed. Walling in the non-Jews or putting them in Bantustans or driving them into Jordan will not make it a purely Jewish state. The nationalist allegiance to "blood and soil" has been a failure and that should be the real lesson of the Holocaust.

9. To say that my op-ed "does not meet our expectation of minimally rational and minimally humane discourse" is nonsense. The piece is well written, well substantiated, and quite humane.

10. But the faculty detractors are quite right about one thing; they were deeply disturbed and saddened to see a Hobart and William Smith title attached to it. Diversity and perspectives outside the mainstream are to be encouraged, but not if they question Jewish power, Israel, or Holocaust doctrine. Apparently that is beyond the pale.

11. The demand to President Gearan to remove my title of Professor Emeritus is both classic and stupid. Consider how little it would accomplish. I would be supposedly ashamed and I would have to buy a walk-in? pass at the gym that would cost me $40 a year. Would it save HWS from being associated with my writings? Of course not; I would simply use the title of "Former Professor Emeritus at Hobart and William Smith Colleges" with no disclaimer.

But what it would really do is to cast me into the briar bush with Norm Finkelstein, Marc Ellis, Paul Eisen, Henry Herskovitz, Gilad Atzmon, Rich Siegel, and Hedy Epstein (a Holocaust survivor), all friends of mine and all anti-Zionists. Professors Ost, Linton, and Mertens apparently saw this and I credit (or blame) them for my still having the emeritus title.

Lest I seem irreverent or unscathed by this widely-circulated smear letter from my detractors, allow me to admit that I have been hurt by it. Many faculty and other HWS folks now shun me as a persona non grata largely because they only read the slime and never a rebuttal. Of course until now there could be no rebuttal because the smear letter was withheld from me. (Even the Provost's request to send me a copy was refused.)

My former student and longtime friend, David Deming, who is now the Chair of the HWS Board, does not answer my letters. President Gearan does not answer them either. Board member, Roy Dexheimer, disparages me and wonders if I fell "off my meds." Another Board member, Stuart Pilch, took it a step further and made a threatening phone call to my home and a promise "to hunt me down."

But the biggest disappointment is with those faculty detractors who never came to discuss or complain about what I had written, but instead chose to spin their own interpretation, which was full of lies and half truths, and then disseminate their smear as widely as possible. Should any of you be one of the signatories, my door is open for further discussion. And if you know the names of the other signatories, I would appreciate your sharing that information with me.

Smith's Note: With the exception of the photo of McGowan, Butz and Herskovitz, which was sent me by Professor Butz, I got it all the above from Michael Hoffman at:

On the Contrary
Michael Hoffman's blog
http://revisionistreview.blogspot.com/

Thanks, Mike.

As noted above, Daniel A. McGowan is Executive Director of Deir Yassin Remembered. Paul Eisen, author of the following article, is on the Board of Directors there. The Board is made up of folk from Canberra, Sydney, Jerusalem, Stockholm, London and the USA. When fully staffed it is twenty people—half Jews, half non-Jews, half men, half women.

As I mentioned here last month, the greatest number of the 2,800 individuals and organizations subscribing to CODOH's Facebook page are identified with the Palestinian cause. All together, I find this a significant fact of life, one that I have been carelessly slow to recognize. It was brought to my attention by Richard Widmann via Inconvenient History only last month. You can imagine my surprise when I received an email from Widmann with an attachment by a Londoner titled**: My Life as a Holocaust Denier.** Sounds like something I would have written. Nope. Written by Paul Eisen, Jew, board member of Deir Yassin Remembered, with special attention given to Ernst and Ingrid Zuendel, Germar Rudolf and others. This is remarkable. How is it possible that I am only now becoming aware of this man and what he has written? I don't know.

In any event, following is an edited version of Paul Eisen's My Life as a Holocaust Denier. I have edited it with a real brutality because of length (Paul: forgive me). I have only now been informed that the original, full-length version has yet to be published. I will publish it at CODOH shortly. Meanwhile, much of the Eisen story is here: http://tinyurl.com/4p43tv

My Life as a Holocaust Denier

By Paul Eisen

In December 2004 I completed my essay "The Holocaust Wars." Nearly 17,000 words long, the essay was the result of six months' dedicated reading and the final piece of a trilogy beginning with "Speaking the Truth to Jews" and followed by "Jewish Power". The manuscript sat on my desk for four months while I wondered what to do with it and in May 2005 it was posted at my request, on Israel Shamir's website. There was hardly any response other than from the revisionist community which was, as expected, positive.

A couple of weeks later, again at my request, it was circulated by Gilad Atzmon on his private e-list. Now controversy broke out centering on the proposed appearance by Gilad at two Socialist Workers Party events. Two Jewish Marxists, Roland Rance and Tony Greenstein, and others were outraged that a declared anti-racist organization like the SWP give a platform to someone who defended and circulated the writings of, if not an actual Holocaust denier, then certainly an apologist for the same.

Paul Eisen

Gilad denied the charge of Holocaust denial, but not only defended my right to think, speak and write as I liked, but also the quality of my thinking and my writing.

Over the next weeks and months high-profile and well-regarded Jewish activists moved to either denounce me, distance themselves from me or work quietly behind the scenes to ensure my marginalization. These included Uri Davis, Jeff Halper, Jeff Blankfort, Michael Rosen, and Uri Avnery.

All this was initiated and guided by Jewish activists, largely Marxist and self-declared anti-Zionists. A petition damning me and my writing was begun by Joel Finkel and endorsed by Sue Blackwell who, after consulting 'Jewish colleagues', promoted the petition and denounced me. Overwhelmingly but not exclusively Jewish, the list included Jeff Halper, Uri Davis and Uri Avnery

While I had been prepared for attacks by Jewish activists and their supporters, nothing could have prepared me for the effects on my family. These people who I love and who love me, and who, despite many disagreements, had taken pride in my Palestinian solidarity activism, now before their eyes, saw their kind, gentle and loving son, brother, husband and father, turn into that most loathsome of life forms—a "Holocaust Denier." Their anger I could bear; harder to bear were their tears.

The Holocaust Wars

"The Holocaust Wars" was written in three sections. The first, called "Scum" (it was Joel Finkel's calling Ernst and Ingrid (Zündel) 'scum' which prompted me to write "The Holocaust Wars"), describes the struggle of Ernst Zündel, currently in jail in Germany for Holocaust denial. This section attempts to contextualize and re-humanize Ernst Zündel and Holocaust revisionism. It also attempts to contextualize and re-humanize the person of Adolf Hitler, the National Socialist regime, and, indeed, the German people. It was this section, provocatively placed at the very front of the essay, which most outraged Jewish activists and their supporters.

The second section, "The War for the Truth," examined the Revisionist community, its scholarship and its struggle. Although I stopped short of coming out in definite agreement with them, I did (and do) acknowledge that I found their case compelling. This section also contained what was, for me, one of the most interesting aspects of these enquiries—under the heading "How Could This Be So?"—a discussion of how, if the Holocaust narrative were to be proven false, it may have come about and how it came to be so widely accepted.

The last section was called "The War for the Spirit" and was concerned with the ideological, spiritual and religious meaning of the Holocaust narrative and the use to which it has been put to enforce Jewish power. For me, this was the most important section of the essay but I doubt whether many critics got that far. I suspect most skimmed the first couple of pages, categorized both it and me and then acted accordingly.

(Norman Finkelstein replied a full ten minutes after I sent him a draft with the instruction not to bother him with such nonsense.)

Holocaust Denier

The process of marginalization is a curious one. Slowly and cumulatively it takes place and in no time at all acquires a momentum all of its own. My own needed no help from me. Within weeks I had ceased to be an individual and had become the Brand—"Eisen the Holocaust denier". As sure as "Beanz Meanz Heinz" I was a Holocaust denier and, once branded, no more need be said. It sufficed that, whenever my name was mentioned, some anti-Zionist Jewish activist would jump up and remind the company of what I was; the rest would take care of itself.

Did I protest? Not one bit. Did I fight back? Not at all. I told myself that to protest my innocence was to grant legitimacy to the accusation but also I rather relished my Christ-like posture—hanging there for the whole world to see. But the real reason for my failure to fight back was, quite simply, that I was terrified out of my wits. Nothing in my life up till then had prepared me for the hatred I experienced.

Racist! Nazi! Holocaust denier!

And as for my 'Holocaust denial', I wasn't at Auschwitz, so I don't know exactly what did or did not take place there. Nor am I any scholar, but I've had a fair look at the evidence and as far as I can see, the revisionists have got it pretty much right. But I'm not a hundred percent sure and I say so, so technically I suppose I'm not a denier. Whether I say this from conviction, cowardice or simply an inability to sever that final link to whatever, I can't say. But I have no doubt that Robert Faurisson, the greatest of all living revisionists, would rage at me for such equivocation.

No, Holocaust revisionism or 'denial' if you like is confined to three main contentions in the typical Holocaust narrative, namely:

- That there ever was an official plan on the part of Hitler or the National Socialist regime to systematically and physically exterminate every Jew in Europe.
- That there existed homicidal gas-chambers.
- That the number of Jewish victims was around six million.

Having examined all these contentions and found them questionable to say the least, it seems to me that a Holocaust revisionist (denier, if you like) is an entirely honorable thing to be. So why should I rush to deny that I am one?

In his article David Aaronovitch quoted me as writing about the gas-chambers: “No one is able to show us, at Auschwitz or anywhere else even one of these chemical slaughterhouses. No one is capable of describing to us their exact appearance or workings. Neither a trace nor a hint of their existence is to be found ...."

Aaronovitch got this wrong. I did not write those words. They were written by Robert Faurisson whom I was quoting. I was urged to protest this inaccuracy which I did successfully with the Press Complaints Commission. (It is the amended version that appears in the article accessed by the link above.) But now I’m not so sure about this. Professor Faurisson’s words were honorable and courageous and probably accurate, so even though I didn’t write those words, why should I now rush to disown them?

The same is true with Ernst Zündel. Why should I not support Ernst Zündel? Ernst Zündel has never committed an act of violence, nor has he ever called on anyone else to commit an act of violence. Ernst Zündel has never discriminated against anyone, nor has he called on anyone else to discriminate against anyone. Ernst Zündel has never stifled anyone’s freedom of expression, nor has he ever called on anyone else to stifle anyone’s freedom of expression. So why should I not support Ernst Zündel’s right to think, speak and write as he pleases? And why do those who go on and on about these rights fall strangely silent when it comes to Ernst Zündel and the other revisionists? And why is it that so many of these folk, so busy, busy, busy defending free speech, at the same time work so hard to create a climate in which that freedom may be so easily denied? Joel Finkel believes in free speech and he calls Ernst and Ingrid ‘scum’.

But I also support Ernst Zündel and Holocaust revisionists because both Ernst and the revisionists are essentially truthful (though one doesn't have to agree with everything they say). It is true that the Holocaust narrative is gravely flawed and could stand some serious examination. It is true that Adolf Hitler and National Socialism were, respectively both human and the creation of humans and both may well not have been any worse than many other brutal regimes and their leaderships, notably Bolshevism. And regarding Ernst’s alleged ‘racism’ it is also true that ethnicity, to my mind simply a mix of biology and culture, matters a lot to people and it may be that the human individual is moved as much by his or her ethnicity, roots and faith and, yes, genetic makeup, as by his or her class and aspirations.

Anyway, I like Ernst.

And I like Ingrid Zündel too, a brave, principled woman with a delightful way about her. I also support Ernst Zündel and the revisionists because they, along with the Palestinian people, are amongst the bravest people on the planet. I may not agree with everything Ernst Zündel does or believes, but his flamboyant activism makes me both laugh out loud at his antics while standing in silent awe at his courage.

But above all I support Ernst Zündel and the revisionists because they, along with the Palestinian and other Arab peoples, are the ultimate victims of, and resisters to, an abusive Jewish power. (Why else are they dealt with so harshly?). Also, they’re the most feared. As Robert Faurisson said, above all, Zionists fear the weak—those with nothing left to lose. And they fear the weapons of the weak: the stones and martyrdom of the Palestinians and the words of the revisionists. They fear the Palestinian Intifada but they also fear that other Intifada—that of the revisionists.

And to those who with querulous, bewildered expressions ask if it really matters if there was or was not a decision to kill all the Jews, whether it was done by shooting, gas-chambers or any other method and whether it was one, one hundred, one thousand, one hundred thousand, one, two, three, four, five or six million Jews? After all, they say self-righteously, is not one death bad enough? And does it matter if it was pre-planned or whether it was by gas, massacre or typhus epidemic? These folks mean to deceive. Under cover of feigned sensitivity and mock horror they conceal their own deep Holocaust worship. So to them I say that it does matter.

Firstly, it matters because the truth matters. But more than that, it matters because it is those three key areas—that Hitler and the National Socialists determined to physically exterminate every Jew in Europe, that in the main this was done on an industrial scale by use of homicidal gas-chambers, and that in the end, six million Jews perished—it is in these contentions that the Holocaust cult resides. Without these iconic embellishments the very real story of the assault on the Jews of Europe ceases to be the Holocaust and becomes just one more terrible atrocity in a history of terrible atrocities. It is these which turn the Holocaust narrative into a religion and it is those which turn its denial into a heresy.

Why bother?

I read recently a letter written by Germar Rudolf from his cell in Stammheim Prison, Stuttgart. The letter examines why Rudolf became a Holocaust revisionist and why he was prepared to pay such a terrible price. The fact is that Germar Rudolf was never much interested in World War II or, for that matter, in the Holocaust. What interested him were the whys and wherefores of lies, delusions and propaganda. Why are they created, how are they propagated, maintained and enforced, and why do we believe in them? So for Rudolf, Holocaust propaganda is not an historical issue but an ideological issue. Nor does there seem to be any single motive for Rudolf's interest, rather a mixture of personal history and personality. From childhood, he tells us, he was blessed or cursed with an insane curiosity and with what he describes as "a greatly overdeveloped sense of justice." We also learn that he was brutalized by his father.

At eighteen he learned of the post-war expulsion of twelve million Germans from East Germany and Eastern Europe and it is from then that he dates his interest in history. He became "a very patriotic German—still within the mainstream yet at the right edge of it." But never did he touch upon the Holocaust topic. "The usual claims about it seemed indubitable, undeniable to me, truth chiseled in stone, self-evident."

But in 1989 he came across the writings of Paul Rassinier, the father of Holocaust revisionism, and everything changed. On his liberation, Rassinier, a former French communist, partisan fighter, and eventual inmate of Buchenwald and Dora concentration camps, began to hear stories of mechanized exterminations in Buchenwald—a claim he knew to be untrue because he had been there—so he wondered what anyone might wonder: If they can lie about that, what else can they lie about? Now, there was no stopping him.

And for the young German patriot Rudolf: "He opened my eyes and allowed doubts. Not more, just doubts."

Like all post-war Germans Rudolf had been raised not to doubt, which in itself maddened him as did the increasing persecution in Germany of anyone who raised the issue.

"….at once I knew—and a little research confirmed it—that any doubts and a dissenter is relentlessly ostracized, persecuted, and even prosecuted with no chance of defense. So I said to myself: This is outrageous, unacceptable, against all norms and ideals of this society, and the fact that there is no other topic where dissent is more severely suppressed is evidence enough for me that it is also the most important topic. He who is sure of being truthful is relaxed; only liars call for earthly judges."

"Give me a meaning of life!" young Germar had demanded, and now he had found it. When so many powerful people worked so hard to stop one peaceful dissident, it must be because he has something that can, and will, rock the world. It was that simple.

"I was sure I was right, and unless I was convinced by rational, scientific arguments that I was wrong, I was not going to give in. They made the mistake to provoke the blood out of me by persecuting me. That's it. No negotiations any more. It's me or them now.

"The only way to take this away from me is by killing me. Period. Anybody who punishes me for merely exercising my human right of being a human, a creature able to doubt and explore, will meet my utmost unbreakable resistance. I won't allow anybody to reduce me to a submissive slave. Nobody."

Germar Rudolf, along with Ernst Zündel, Robert Faurisson, David Irving, Jurgen Graf, Udo Walendy, Carlo Mattogno, Erhard Kempner, Wolfgang Froehlich, Michel Adam, Pedro Varela, Gary Lauck, Gunter Deckert and many, many others have paid, and are paying, a terrible price and none more terrible than the price obviously paid by Rudolf as indicated in the dedication of his "Lectures on the Holocaust." "For Tamara, Kay and Natalie. Hoping that one day they will understand."

Deny the Holocaust!

That Jews suffered greatly from 1933 to 1945 is not in question, but the notion of a premeditated, planned and industrial extermination of Europe's Jews with its iconic gas-chambers and magical six million are all used to make the Holocaust not only special but also sacred. We are faced with a new, secular religion, a false God with astonishing power to command worship. And, like the Crucifixion with its Cross, Resurrection, etc., the Holocaust has key and sacred elements—the exterminationist imperative, the gas chambers, and the sacred six million. It is these that comprise the holy Holocaust which Jews, Zionists and others

worship and which Ernst and the revisionists refuse to worship.

Nor is this a small matter. If it was, why the fuss, why the witch-hunt, why the imprisonment of David Irving, Germar Rudolf and Ernst Zündel? And it's not just them. What may be a massive lie is being used to oppress pretty much all of humankind. The German and Austrian peoples who, we are told, conceived and perpetrated the slaughter; the Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Rumanian, Hungarian peoples etc., etc. who supposedly hosted, assisted in and cheered on the slaughter; the Americans, the British, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Italians (but not the Danes and the Bulgarians) etc. who apparently didn't do enough to stop the slaughter; the Swiss who stayed out of the slaughter, and the entire Christian world who, it seems, created the faith-traditions and ideologies in which the slaughter could take place—and now the Palestinian, Arab and Muslim peoples who seemingly want to perpetrate a new slaughter—in fact, the Holocaust oppresses the entire non-Jewish world and indeed much of the Jewish world as well. Stand and have done with it. Deny the Holocaust.

Death Camp Survivors' Personal Plea to Facebook to Change Holocaust-Denial Policy

July 8th, 2011
Los Angeles, California

Dear Facebook,

We, the undersigned, are Holocaust Survivors who saw our parents, children and loved ones brutally murdered by the Nazis during the Holocaust. We are writing to you to protest Facebook's policy that categorizes Holocaust denial as "free speech," rather than the shameless, cynical and hateful propaganda that it is.

Listen to the voices of Holocaust Survivors. We volunteer and speak at the Simon Wiesenthal Center (SWC) and the Museum of Tolerance (MOT), where we have shared our personal testimonies with millions of visitors and youth. As individuals who are both victims of and witnesses to the truth of the horrors and hate of that time period, we are deeply hurt and offended by your policy that protects Holocaust denial as speech. Above all else, Holocaust denial, in any form, is a desecration of our suffering the suffering and martyrdom of our murdered parents, brothers and sisters.

The SWC has assured us that Facebook is a company with integrity, a company that is willing to live up to its moral and social

Rabbi Abraham Cooper
The Simon Wiesenthal Center

responsibilities, as you have done in the past by removing hateful postings. Therefore, we have chosen to
write to you, under the good auspices of the SWC & MOT, and appeal to you, both individually and collectively, to reevaluate your existing policy.

Do not permit Holocaust denial any platform on Facebook to preach its inherent message of lies and hate. By allowing this hate propaganda on Facebook, you are exposing the public and, in particular, youth to the anti-Semitism which fueled the Holocaust. Please correct this terrible error in judgment before our generation passes away.

Sincerely,

The letter is signed by 21 self-identified "survivors."

On July 28, 2011 Facebook, citing the concept of free speech, rejected the SWC-sponsored request by Holocaust survivors to censor Facebook by saying:

"We think it's important to maintain consistency in our policies, which don't generally prohibit people from making statements about historical events, no matter how ignorant the statement or how awful the event."

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA) notes that the letter "goes on to point out that not only are the Holocaust-denial sites offensive and hateful, but also could negatively influence scores of people due to Facebook's popularity and accessibility."

Scores? CODOH alone, together with the CODOH Forum, gets more than a million hits monthly. They wish it were "scores"!

"Rabbi Abraham Cooper, the center's associate dean, criticized Facebook's policy on Holocaust denial.

"'A review of denial sites currently active on Facebook confirms that it is not mere speech but that it constitutes at its core a platform for bigotry and hatred of Jews, dead and alive,' said Cooper, who briefs online companies such as Facebook, Google and Yahoo on digital hate and terrorism.

"He added, 'We will continue to urge Facebook officials to reflect on the pain and suffering their policy is causing victims of the Shoah. For these aging heroes, every posting by deniers labels them, not victims of history's greatest crime, but liars and thieves.'"

The Simon Wiesenthal Center is named after—exploits the name of—a demonstrable fraud and liar (see http://tinyurl.com/n32f86). Keeping to that tradition, the rabbis at the newly opened Simon Wiesenthal Center originally displayed—exploited—a lampshade made from human skin. Jewish? Of course it was Jewish. Manufactured by Germans? Of course it was manufactured by Germans.

But whatever happened to it?

With regard to Facebook, we have a page there with 2,500 subscribers and growing. As mentioned here before, a good many of those "friends" represent friends of Palestine.

Campus Bogeyman: A Manual for Action

Continued from page 2

us budgets, and grants of tenure throughout academia. "Profound impact" indeed.

This is all about an old guy in Mexico who seeks to place his ideologically (remember when ideology was a common fixture on college campuses?) based paid ads among those for American Apparel, Dell Computers, and health insurance for students. And it is a tribute. Half or more of the Manual (do read it all—it's mostly about us) concerns this one guy who places little ads among the many much-bigger ones advertising clothing, insurance, and computers that now clutter the shoppers that pass for college newspapers in the present day. Ideology—ideas for that matter—not needed nor wanted.

Smith and his Committee on Open Debate of the Holocaust (CODOH), and Smith/CODOH alone, has been conducting his campaign to penetrate the minds of college students (and secretly some few of their professors) since, the Manual says, at least 1991, and the Manual, despite its hostile intent and editorializing, constitutes one of the most detailed and informative dossiers on Smith and CODOH outside Wikipedia (whose own editorializing reflects a full agreement with Hillel's and ADL's hostility).

The Manual's solicitude for peacefulness and tranquility (never mind the ROTC, fraternity parties, and demonstrations "for peace" that erupt whenever conscription is in effect) attains laughable levels at points like Page 18 where, under the heading, "Strategizing a Response When the Ad Is Published," this list is presented:

"In the aftermath of publication, Hillel objectives should be to:

- reassure Jewish students that you are there to help;
- secure a high-profile retraction and apology from the school newspaper;
- secure a clear and strong statement from the college/university president;
- turn the incident into an opportunity for growth and education."

The hypocrisy of these instructions in defense of peace and quiet on campus is profound, indeed. Hillel is "there to help" Jewish students do what? Object? Protest? Counterattack? Secure an abject *mea culpa* from a newspaper that sells advertising in violation of Hillel's imprimatur? Secure a statement from a college/university president from whom most campus newspapers claim to be independent, and whose job in any case is not supposed to include the monitoring and control of historical discussions arising on the campus?

Turn the incident into an opportunity to "grow and educate" what? The power and righteousness of the Middle East's only nuclear power, sustained and abetted by the gulled and fleeced taxpayers of America?

There is one point on which the Manual undertakes to "educate" newspaper editors and advertising managers with which Smith and CODOH surely agree: they have the right to reject any material, be it advertising or editorial, they choose to reject. Not only are they free to reject paid advertising from CODOH, they are free to reject advice, "education," and threats from Hillel and its big brother in town, the Anti-Defamation League.

The Manual's instructions on this point make reference to the First Amendment of the US Constitution, which brings us back to the national entity to whose advancement Hillel has explicitly dedicated itself: Israel. There, not only is it a crime to discuss Holocaust history outside narrow, officially approved boundaries, but the Middle East's "only democracy" has further enacted sanctions against anyone advocating the boycotting of products produced in Israel or the territories occupied by Israel after its 1967 war of conquest against its neighbors. No Bradley Smiths in Israel, that's for sure. What Hillel/ADL would busy themselves with in the Promised Land does not offer an appealing subject of contemplation.

For anyone entertaining the slightest doubt that the Holocaust legend is the sustaining mythology of Israel and its imperial expansion over Palestine, an overview of "Fighting Holocaust Denial on Campus" will dispel such a notion decisively. The Manual itself outlines the progression quite nicely: open debate on the Holocaust. Holocaust Denial. Anti-Semitism. Delegitimization of Israel. One, two, three (er, perhaps four). Three sins at one stroke, just for intellectual curiosity about a taboo subject. The reason for the taboo is to be found in Items Three and Four, which are not the intention of Smith/ CODOH's program, but which evidently Hillel/ADL fear as its effects.

One of these exhibits, the one that withholds the names and dates, details a newspaper that refused to recant its crime (Page 21). The fate of the unnamed stalwart is not given, but one may assume with confidence that, if she is still alive, she is not practicing journalism in any non-Arab country.

And it *is* a taboo subject. The Manual makes no bones about this: perhaps alone across the vast spectrum of ideas, *this one* subject will be opposed with all possible vigor if any otherwise-placid campus should be invaded by it. No matter that Smith/CODOH has never "denied" the Holocaust, whatever doing that might really be.

The Manual for Action would make chilling reading indeed for editors and advertising managers of campus newspapers, not to mention for college administrators and journalism students. The Manual prints at length and in detail, long, abject apologies somehow wrung from editors and administrators alike who committed the transgression of allowing one of CODOH's sinful incitements to stain the pages of their publication. In addition to the spectacle of these public self-flagellations prescribed among the goals listed above in the manual, transgressing editors and advertising managers have been forced to troop through gauntlets of atonement such as the US Holocaust Memorial and Museum (presumably in winter, to minimize the junket benefits of the purgatory).

One of these exhibits, the one that withholds the names and dates, details a newspaper that *refused* to recant its crime (Page 21). The fate of the unnamed stalwart is not given, but one may assume with confidence that, if she is still alive, she is *not* practicing journalism in any non-Arab country.

The Manual, in fact, prescribes (Page 16) pre-emptive calls (not to be confused with threats, of course) on newspaper editors and staffs to warn them of what will happen to them in the event they happen to fall prey to Smith's insidious blandishments (the instruction itself is worded somewhat differently).

One might even imagine Smith/CODOH tempted to "help" Hillel/ADL spread their censorious words by supplying the entire manual (easy enough, in this age of the Internet) in advance to newspaper staffs, journalism professors and students, even political science and advertising departments as an object example of … well, let's just call it a Manual for Action.

You will find the real thing here: http://tinyurl.com/ykopqw8

Deborah Lipstadt vs. David Irving?

From Eric Hunt's **The Revisionist Workshop**
See: http://tinyurl.com/3ee8nrs

In 1986 Deborah Lipstadt published *Beyond Belief: The American Press and the Coming of the Holocaust, 1933-1945.* In which she states:

"Of the approximately 4 million people killed at Auschwitz a minimum of 2 million were Jews. All of them were citizens of various European countries, but they were killed as Jews."

We're told that "few historians believed that figure" of 4 million killed at Auschwitz. Professor Lipstadt along with her source she cited for the 4 million figure in her book; Sir Martin Gilbert, are obviously amongst the few who did.

But, we all make mistakes, so we could forgive Professor Lipstadt for this error, if it were not perhaps for her own damning of David Irving for figures he has used in his 1963 book *The Destruction of Dresden*, whilst estimating the death toll for the bombing. Professor Lipstadt writes on her blog:

"Charles Gray, the presiding judge in my case, found Irving's treatment of the Dresden historical record 'reprehensible' and "absurd" and concluded that Irving's work on this topic "fell far short of the standard to be expected of a conscientious historian."

Really now Professor Lipstadt. Pot, kettle?

What have we here?

It's the middle of summer, the campus press is closed down, the professors are off to the South Seas, Smith has had a computer failure of considerable depth and extension which undercut the work during much of July. Along with a sleeping disability which, for this elderly gentleman Mr. Smith, is a heavy burden to bear. Nevertheless, the work does go on. In July alone these are the figures we have bragging rights to.

There were 694,834 hits on the CODOH Home page in July.

The CODOH Forum, independently from the CODOH Homepage, received 409,733 hits.

There were another 74,430 hits on the home pages of Inconvenient History and the Inconvenient History Blog.

Again, this was in July alone. Well above a million hits. What does that suggest for the year—13, 14, 15 million hits?

And then there is Facebook where we have 2,800 subscribers ("friends"), a good percentage of whom are "Friends of Palestine." That may suggest one reason that the Simon Wiesenthal Center and its rabbis are trying once again to convince the young Mr. Mark Zukerberg, primary creator and present CEO of Facebook, to censor holocaust revisionism.

Not bad for an enterprise (he says) run out of one room in a house in Baja with one regular part-time employee and a number of over-the-top dedicated volunteers. As a point of fact, very little of this could be accomplished without those committed volunteers.

Now the time is come to face off with the manufacturers of the ADL/Hillel project it has chosen to call "Fighting Holocaust Denial in Campus Newspaper Advertisements: A Manual for Action." I have not ignored this publication, but I have not exploited what has been described as the "gold mine" of possibilities that it presents.

And now the time is come to ask you (again, forgive me), to contribute to the work. June was a good month with regard to contributions, but July was a calamity. I need your help to continue to make this work—work.

Thank you.

Bradley

Smith's Report
is published by

Committee for
Open Debate
on the Holocaust

Bradley R. Smith, Founder

For your contribution of $39
you will receive 12 issues of
Smith's Report.
Canada and Mexico--$45
Overseas--$49

Letters and Donations to:

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Desk: 209 682 5327

Email
bradley1930@yahoo.co